

CONFIDENTIAL

✓
gpc

14 September 1960

2
3 95

Chief

25X1

London Bureau, FBIS
c/o American Embassy
#1 Grosvenor Square
London W. 1, England

Dear Tom:

Subject: NEC Coverage

Your 30 August letter about your talks with John Campbell is an excellent résumé of our NEC coverage problem, and I concur in the statements you made to him.

Although I understand Campbell's position on coverage, I do not understand why he should feel that the statement of FBIS requirements presented at the last Coordination Committee meeting can now be disregarded. Our position should continue to be based on this statement. We need a specific answer to it from Campbell, even if negative; and he should be told that FBIS coverage of services shown on the list is temporary and in no way negates our requirement on NEC. It is already eleven months since the meeting, and I doubt that we should, by presenting a new request, in effect support Campbell's contention that last October's statement no longer is valid.

25X1

Attached for your information is a copy of some notes given [redacted] for his visit to London Bureau. Although he will not be prepared to discuss coverage in detail, he understands the principle involved. If you both agree, I suggest that he express concern to NEC and reiterate our urgent need for an answer to our statement of requirements. I also suggest you withhold submitting a draft letter from me to Campbell pending discussion with Mr. [redacted]

25X1

Sincerely,

25X1

Chief, FBIS

Attachment

cc RPB
Ed Br
FOS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE
AMERICAN EMBASSY
LONDON, W.I.

30 August 1960

STAT

[redacted], Chief
Foreign Broadcast Information Service
2430 E. Street N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Roger:

Subject: Talks with BBC

John Campbell and I had an informal and unscheduled talk in my office in which we discussed basic principles of coverage of the two monitoring services. I made it plain that what I had to say represented my own ideas on coverage, although I thought that in most cases what I had to say represented Washington thinking.

I pointed out that the BBC was covering fewer programs than it had been in 1954, whereas FBIS had considerably expanded its coverage. This trend, I said, meant that FBIS was not only covering a substantial number of programs from its own natural areas of coverage but in addition was assuming nearly two-thirds of the expansion of Moscow foreign-language programs in BBC area of coverage.

I said I did not see how FBIS could do its job without a massive sample ranging between 75 and 100 percent of Moscow foreign-language programs, although the BBC had continued to cut the percentage of this material which it covered. I added that I thought the BBC and FBIS should have an understanding that both services would assume responsibility for certain areas of coverage.

*do we have
copy of
agreement?*

John replied that the cuts made in 1954 were with the agreement of FBIS and that a further cut in Moscow Spanish was made in an agreement with you. Other new Moscow programs were covered if their coverage was considered essential, he added. He said he believed the BBC was already covering more Moscow foreign-language material than was warranted by its value to the Monitoring Service, but that the BBC was glad to cover some extra material for FBIS.

-2-

STAT

John set 50 percent as the amount of Moscow foreign-language material as the proper level for coverage and held that representative rather than saturation coverage was a sign of wise monitoring. He said that the BBC did not have money to do more monitoring and that he had been forced to say no to many people who asked for material beyond the resources of the Monitoring Service, and that those who received negative replies to their requests included the Foreign Office. Finally, he said that he felt you understood his position on the question of coverage.

I repeated that one monitoring service or the other would have to take over essential coverage and that I felt there should be an understanding between FBIS and the BBC that the essential coverage should be taken by the monitoring service in whose coverage areas the vital new programs were broadcast. If the monitoring service did not have enough resources, they would have to get them, I added, and perhaps the BBC might be assisted in this endeavor by another high-level letter on the requirements of FBIS.

Why? - John replied that he hoped there would be no high-level letter until after there had been another coordination-meeting. Our talk, which was quite friendly, ended with this.

My own personal view is that John does not believe in exhaustive Moscow foreign-language coverage and is prepared to trim other coverage almost out of existence to save money and to free monitors to listen to programs which are of special British interest. He is not willing to go to his masters and say he would like to get more money to do monitoring of interest only to Americans, particularly since his own boss, Sir Beresford Clark, through whom he would have to make the approach thinks the Monitoring Service already has a bigger share of the External Services money pie than it should.

It seems that FBIS is expanding its coverage in Latin America and the Far East with some difficulty, while at the same time it must use its domestic personnel at Hedgeneck to monitor such programs as Moscow Spanish to L.A. which the BBC has cut from its coverage schedule. The basic trend can be seen in the attached chart which shows that while FBIS has increased its voice coverage 22 percent since 1954, the BBC has decreased theirs 13 percent. The reduction of coverage during years when there has been a considerable expansion of broadcasting seems almost unbelievable.

-3-

In one week I will be sending you a background paper giving you a complete picture of the exact state of BBC coverage.

At this point I believe that the BBC must be asked by you to take over all Moscow foreign-language broadcasts in its area together with more coverage in other specified areas within one year. Only with such a formidable but completely reasonable request will FBIS receive a firm answer which could form the basis of a high-level appeal. As it is, John thinks that FBIS has taken over about 13 hours of BBC Moscow foreign-language and that this represents a permanent transfer agreed upon by FBIS. As he sees it FBIS and the BBC between them are now covering at least the minimum percentage of Moscow foreign-language programs and no further action in connection with paragraph five of the last coordination-meeting minutes will be required from him.

With my background study of coverage I will enclose a draft of the type of letter I think John should receive from you on coverage. Without a direct question as to whether the BBC will undertake specific coverage by a given date, I fear we shall never hear more about the question put to the BBC in the coordination-meeting minutes.

Sincerely,

STAT

[Redacted Signature]

Chief, London Bureau

We want
a statement
from BBC

BBC AND FBIS COVERAGE OF VOICE BROADCASTS IN 1954, 1956, AND 1960

Daily Average Total Hours of Voice Broadcasts Covered:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>B B C</u>			<u>F B I S</u>		
	Total Hrs Covered Daily	1954 Hrs.	on Cover Percent	Total Hrs Covered Daily	Increase on 1954 Hrs.	Cover Percent
Dec. 1954	171	-	-	212	-	-
Dec. 1956	135			219	7	3
July 1960	148 *			259 #	47	22

* Includes an estimated 12 hours of Soviet Regionals.

This figure includes 34 hours of Soviet Regionals,
but does not include 7 hours of irregular coverage.

29 August 1960

Dear John:

Thanks for your note of 5 August on the coverage of Moscow foreign language programs. The German Bureau says that it would be ready to begin coverage of the three Moscow German programs mentioned in your note on 6 September, if that would be satisfactory with you.

I certainly agree that these alterations should be of a trial nature and I suggest that we discuss the service from Frankfurt to the BBC after the coverage changes have been in effect for a few months.

As you know, FBIS naturally considers that the best place from which to cover Moscow foreign language programs audible at Caversham is here, and it must consider this transfer as a temporary expedient to provide essential coverage pending a final resolution of the question.

Could you give me a ring if the 6 September date is all right so that I can message and give him a few days notice. If the date is not satisfactory, could you suggest one suitable to you.

STAT

